

Dear Dan and Kim,

I'm asking Richard Vine, the editor of Dialogue, to add a bit more about Kim.

As for the rest, you may want to write a letter to Richard.

I've observed that when artists put their work out in public both the work and their own lives/careers become objects of discussion. Artists just have to learn to live with this: it is part of being petty bourgeois professionals. You cannot expect critics, colleagues, curators, and others to not form their own opinions and views, and to subsequently circulate them, even in print. Gossip is part of the biz. It would be nice for makers if they could just send out a press release and have that represent them, but it doesn't happen that way. This is the nature of celebrity.

I am hardly ignorant of Dan's creative work, having seen most of it over a period of ten years, and being enthusiastic about a good part of it; nor am I uninformed about Dan's career. I was there when it started, and Dan has subsequently presented his work in my classroom. We discussed it at some length at the experimental film coalition's meetings a few years ago. At the coalition Dan made a number of remarks about Grand Valley and his relation to it in a public forum which I chaired. Later, when you moved to Chicago, I formed an impression from talking with you one evening at Chicago Filmmakers. It didn't seem to me that what you expressed then--extremely strong feelings about Grand Valley--was a secret. Much media work is project oriented, and creative people come and go in print, broadcast, advertising, photography, and allied media. Everyone has stories of creative differences, angry dissolutions of projects, etc. Same in academe. I don't see that having people know you left a job in anger or after being burned out by it is anything to hide or be ashamed of. It happens all the time. To the nicest people.

I thought that by reviewing your film, I'd give it some attention. I also thought I'd be responding to Fred Camper's previously printed characterization of Dan's work. My understanding with the editor changed as we discussed his concept of the magazine. He wanted an issues oriented column rather than a "best of what I've seen" review piece. This is absolutely routine and normal editor/writer interaction.

Unfortunately I was very disappointed in the film. So I did write about it, but that part was cut in editing for length by the editor. Again, this is a totally routine and normal editor/writer event.

Since you do artistic work in your nonemployed, nonsalaried time, you do creative work in your leisure time. This is a

well known distinction. Or do you mean that your employer pays you for the time that you work on your own projects?

Anyway, Dan, I think you're getting quite enough attention being mentioned in two columns.

Much more seriously, though, the edited column totally dropped out mention of Kim Loughlin, codirector with Curry of Southwestern Ballet (she's seen in the production still illustrating the column), and how her career contrasted with his. Trained as a sculptor and photographer, she's taught in college a couple of years, but mostly supported herself with nonacademic jobs such as window dresser and food stylist. That women artists can be so casually disappeared from art criticism marks a pernicious norm--one that must change. So my next column will be about Midwest women media artists such as Lilly Boruzskowski, Celia Condit, Doyle Detroit, Pam Falkenberg and Donna Kennedy, who are making witty satires here in the heartland.

Stay in touch,